



ARLINGTON FINANCE COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING

4/4/2022 7:30 PM

Conducted by Remote Participation – Zoom Meeting

ATTENDEES

Gibian	P	Padaria	L	Harmer	P	Tosti	P
Blundell	P	Migliazzo	P	LaCourt	L	Nascimento	P
Ellis	L	Wallach	P	Jones	P	Deshler	P
Healy	P	Foskett	P	Kocur	A	Carman	P
Beck	P	Crawford Pokress	P	Kellar	P	McKenna	P
						Bradley	P

P indicates Present; L indicates late; A indicates Absent

Visitors: Amos Meeks (Article 11 Proponent), Susan Ryan-Vollmar (LGBTQIA+ Rainbow Commission Co-Chair), Elaine Crowder (Article 18 Proponent), Carey Theil (Article 18 Proponent), Laura Kiesel (resident)

INTRODUCTION

1. Foskett read the rules for the meeting as formulated by Town Counsel based on the Governor's authorization. An important rule is that all votes, unless unanimous, must be by roll call. Attendance was taken by roll call. A vote of "unanimous" means "unanimous vote by all present". The Chair votes only when there is a tie.

MINUTES

1. 3/30/22 meeting minutes were accepted with 12 in favor and three abstentions (Harmer, Carman and Nascimento; Nascimento voted yes verbally but later requested to change her vote to abstain as she was not present at the 3/30/22 meeting). LaCourt, Padaria and Ellis joined after this vote.

BUDGETS AND ARTICLES

1. Domestic Partnerships (Warrant Article No. 11)
 - a. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to take no position on this article. Padaria and LaCourt joined after this vote.
2. Rodenticides (Warrant Article No. 18)
 - a. Crowder indicated that this article is proceeding without Portion 1 language requiring the phasing out the use of certain rodenticides due to state preemption.
 - b. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to take no position on this article.
3. Insurance Reconsideration (No. 26)

- a. The committee reconsidered the Insurance budget following changes to insurance offsets relating to the Ed Burns Arena, Recreation and Water/Sewer Enterprise Funds.
 - b. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to approve the updated Insurance budget totaling \$21,772,313.
4. Commission on Disability (Warrant Article No. 56d)
- a. Under state law, the Town is authorized to allocate to the Commission on Disability all fines collected by the Town for Handicap Parking violations. The amount allocated has been \$25,000 since FY20 which was reached as an agreement to ease administrative logistics. Migliazzo suggested that there be a Finance Committee liaison to the Commission. Foskett proposed that Migliazzo volunteer to be the liaison to the Commission on Disability and Migliazzo agreed.
 - b. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to accept the \$25,000 budget appropriation to the Commission and to accept the proposal of a Finance Committee liaison to the Commission.
5. Harry Barber Community Service Program (Warrant Article No. 63)
- a. VOTE: the committee accepted unanimously the relocation of the Harry Barber appropriation into the Committees & Commissions Warrant Article (No. 56) and to approve the \$7,500 appropriation.
 - b. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to take no action on Warrant Article No. 63 contingent upon the Chair and the Town Comptroller's determination that the Harry Barber appropriation is able to be relocated into the Committees & Commissions Warrant Article (No. 56). Should the relocation of the appropriation not be possible, at the determination of the Chair and the Town Comptroller, the committee appropriates \$7,500 to the Harry Barber Service Program. LaCourt and Crawford Pokress left the meeting before this vote.
6. Elastic Clause
- a. VOTE: a motion was approved unanimously to grant authority to the Chair and Vice Chair Alan Jones to correct small clerical or administrative errors which may discovered during the course of writing the Finance Committee Report to 2022 Town Meeting without requiring another vote by the committee.
7. Reconsideration of the 3/2/22 Meeting Minutes
- a. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to reconsider and correct Meeting Minutes from the 3/2/22 meeting to reflect the Town's share of the Minuteman budget for a corrected appropriation totaling \$7,947,939.
8. Reconsideration of Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust Fund (Warrant Article No. 67)
- a. Town auditors determined that the yearly management expenses of \$43,000 is a Town expense and not a pension expense.
 - b. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to appropriate into said Other Post-Employment Benefits Fund (OPEB), authorized by Chapter 161 of the Acts of 2005, for investment and expenses the sum of \$500,000 representing that amount of money that was previously appropriated for the Non-Contributory Pension when this funding program started; said sum to be raised by the general tax.

9. Use of Free Cash (Warrant Article No. 71)

- a. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously that the sum of \$5,539,215 be taken from available funds in the treasury, and that the Board of Assessors is instructed to use said amount in the determination of the tax rate.

10. Fiscal Stability Stabilization Fund (Warrant Article No. 72)

- a. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously that the sum of \$2,946,037 be and hereby is appropriated from the Fiscal Stability Stabilizaton Fund, and that the Board of Assessors is instructed to use said amount in the determination of the tax rate.

11. Local Options Taxes (Warrant Article No. 66)

- a. VOTE: the committee voted unanimously to take no action on this article.

12. Summary

Budget #	Budget Name	Amount	Status
WA 11	Domestic Partnerships		No Position
WA 18	Rodenticides		No Position
26	Insurance – Reconsideration	\$21,772,313	Approved
56-d	Commission on Disability	\$25,000	Accepted
63	Harry Barber Community Service	\$7,500	No Position* *see # 5 above
67	OPEB Trust Fund – clarification covering investment and expenses	\$500,000	Approved
71	Use of Free Cash	\$5,539,215	Approved
72	Fiscal Stability Stabilization Fund	\$2,946,037	Approved

CONCLUSION

The meeting adjourned at 9:09 pm.

The next meeting is Wednesday, April 13, 2022 at 7:30 PM.

Tara Bradley
4/11/2022

Reference 1: LGBTQIA Rainbow Commission Memo to Finance Committee

Reference 2: Arlington Domestic Partnership Bylaw Redlined

Reference 3: Warrant Article 18 for 2022 Town Meeting

Reference 4: Rodenticides Warrant Email – Bongiorno 20220331

Reference 5: Department of Health & Human Services Memo to Finance Committee

To: Arlington Finance Committee

From: Lisa Krinsky and Susan Ryan-Vollmar, co-chairs, LGBTQIA+ Rainbow Commission

Date: March 4, 2022

Re: Finance Committee hearing on Warrant Article 11

Warrant Article 11 seeks to update Article 23 in Title 1 of the Town Bylaws to more clearly define the parameters of domestic partnerships in Arlington and the administrative processes related to them. It also specifies employment benefits with relation to domestic partnerships in Arlington.

Since Town Meeting approved the addition of Article 23 in Title 1 of the Town Bylaws, there have been three (3) registrations of domestic partnerships in Arlington. The fee to file is \$30, so the town has collected \$90 in domestic partnership registrations.

One of the proposed bylaw changes in Warrant Article 11 is a new Section 6 titled "Employment Benefits."

If town employees registered for domestic partnerships, this section delineates the following paid employment benefits for them:

- paid bereavement leave for the death of a domestic partner or family member of a domestic partner;
- sick leave to care for a domestic partner to the same extent permitted to care for a spouse, and to care for a dependent of a domestic partnership to the same extent permitted to care for a child
- parental leave, as provided for under the Town's by-laws, to the same extent as married employees

After making an inquiry to the Town's Health and Human Services Department about how to estimate potential costs to the town under the proposed Section 6, we learned the following:

- Calculating costs would be dependent on the employee's hourly rate and job type. Most town employees do not incur additional costs when they are out on leave since there is no back-fill for a position unless it is a public safety job such as police, fire or DPW during certain seasons.
- None of those persons who have thus far registered for domestic partnerships in Arlington are town employees.

Last, we have received questions from other town commissions, committees, and boards about whether approval of Warrant Article 11 would permit town employees in registered domestic partnership to cover their domestic partners on town health insurance plans. They would not be able to do this. State law restricts health insurance coverage to the children and legal spouses of employees.

Section 1. Purpose and Intent

The Town of Arlington (“Town”) recognizes the diverse composition of its citizenry and realizes that a perpetuation of the traditional meaning of “family” can exclude a segment of the Town’s population by: (1) depriving them of recognition and validation; and (2) denying them certain rights and responsibilities that should be afforded to persons who share their homes, hearts and lives. Recognizing its commitment to fair treatment of its citizens, the Town adopts this Bylaw that acknowledges domestic partnerships. People in committed relationships who meet the criteria established by the Town as constituting a domestic partnership are provided an opportunity by this Bylaw to register at the office of the Town Clerk, obtain a certificate attesting to their status, and share in certain rights and benefits conferred under this Bylaw.

Section 2. Definitions

A. “Domestic partnership” shall mean two or more persons who meet all of the following requirements and who register their domestic partnership in accordance with Title I, Article 23, Section 3.

- (1) They have made a commitment of mutual support and caring for their domestic partners;
- ~~(2) They reside together and intend to do so indefinitely;~~
- ~~(3) They share basic living expenses;~~
- (2) They are at least eighteen (18) years of age;
- (3) They are competent to enter into a contract; and
- (4) They are not ~~married to anyone or~~ related ~~to each other~~ by blood closer than would bar marriage in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

B. “Dependents” shall mean a child or step-child of any domestic partner.

Section 3. Registration, Amendment and Termination

A. Registration

- (1) Statement of Domestic Partnership
 - (a) Domestic partners who meet the requirements set forth in Title I, Article 23, Section 2(A) of this Bylaw may make an official record of their domestic partnership by completing, signing and submitting to the Town Clerk a statement of domestic partnership. Persons submitting a statement of domestic partnership must declare under penalty of perjury that they meet the requirements set forth in Title I, Article 23, Section 2(A) of this Bylaw.
 - (b) The domestic partnership statement shall be on a form prescribed by the Town Clerk, which form shall include, but shall not be limited to, the names of the domestic partners and the date on which they became each other's domestic partners and the names and dates of birth of any dependents of the domestic partnership.
 - (c) If any member of the prospective domestic partnership is married or in another domestic partnership, a notarized Affidavit of Consent is needed from all other current domestic partners or spouses

B. Amendments

- (1) To change an address, domestic partners may file a Domestic Partnership Amendment Form with the Town Clerk. The amendment shall be signed, under the pains and penalties of perjury, by all of the domestic partners whose addresses are changing.
- (2) To add or remove dependents, domestic partners may file a Domestic Partnership Amendment Form with the Town Clerk. The amendment shall be signed, under the pains and penalties of perjury, by all of the domestic partners.
- (3) To add domestic partners, the prospective domestic partners may file a Domestic Partnership Amendment Form with the Town Clerk. If any member of the prospective domestic partnership is married or in another domestic partnership, a notarized Affidavit of Consent is needed from all other current domestic partners or spouses in order to add additional partners to an already established domestic partnership. The amendment shall be signed, under the pains and penalties of perjury, by all of the current and new domestic partners.

C. Withdrawal and Termination

- (1) Any member of a domestic partnership may withdraw from the domestic partnership by filing a withdrawal statement with the Town Clerk. Withdrawal from a domestic partnership shall become effective immediately when the withdrawal statement is filed with the Town Clerk. Any person filing a withdrawal statement must declare under the pains and penalties of perjury that they have withdrawn and that all other domestic partners have been notified of such withdrawal either personally or by mailing a copy of the withdrawal statement to the other domestic partner's last and usual address by certified mail.
- (2) If only one or zero domestic partner(s) remain(s) after a withdrawal goes into effect, then the domestic partnership is considered terminated immediately. If there are two or more persons remaining in a domestic partnership after a withdrawal goes into effect, then the withdrawal does not terminate the domestic partnership as to the remaining persons in the domestic partnership.
- (3) The death of a domestic partner functions as a withdrawal from the domestic partnership as to that partner, but not as to the remaining persons in the domestic partnership. Such withdrawal will be effective immediately

Section 4. Town Clerk

- A. The Town Clerk shall maintain records of the registration, amendment, withdrawal and termination of domestic partnerships as permanent records. The Town Clerk shall provide appropriate forms for a Statement of Domestic Partnership, for the registration of the Statement and for the amendment, withdrawal and termination of a domestic partnership.**
- B. The Town Clerk shall charge a fee for filing a domestic partnership equal to the fee charged to file a marriage license. Payment of the filing fee shall entitle the person filing the statement on behalf of the domestic partnership to receive one**

copy of the statement certified by the Town Clerk. The fee for additional certified copies of the statement, or for copies of amendment, withdrawal, or termination statements, shall be the same fee charged for additional certified copies of a marriage license.

Section 5. Rights of Domestic Partners

Persons who have registered their domestic partnership with the Town Clerk pursuant to Title I, Article 23, Section 3 are entitled to the following rights:

A. Visitation at health-care facilities.

- (1) A domestic partner shall have the same visitation rights as a spouse or parent of a patient at all health-care facilities operated and maintained by the Town, except to the extent that doing so would conflict with federal or state law. A dependent shall have the same visitation rights as a patient's child.

- (2) The term "health care facilities" includes hospitals, convalescent facilities, mental health care facilities, nursing homes, and other short and long term care facilities operated and maintained by the Town.

B. Visitation at correctional facilities.

- (1) A domestic partner shall have the same visitation rights at all correctional facilities operated and maintained by the Town-as a spouseor parent of a person in custody, except to the extent that doing so would conflict with federal or state law. A dependent shall have the same visitation rights afforded to the child of a person in custody.
- (2) The term "correctional facilities" includes, but is not limited to, holdingcells, jails and juvenile correction centers operated and maintained by the Town.

C. Access to children's school records and personnel.

- (1) A domestic partner who is also the custodial parent or legal guardian of a child may file a school authorization form at, or send a letter to, the child's school to indicate that the parent's domestic partner shall have access to the child's records, access to school personnel in matters concerning the child and access to the child, including the right to remove such child from the school for sickness or family emergency. The school shall afford such person access as directed by the child's existing parent or guardian, except to the extent that doing so would conflict with federal or state law.
- (2) When a domestic partnership is withdrawn or terminated pursuant to Title I, Article 23, Section 3(C), it is the responsibility of the parent or guardian to notify the school, in writing, of the termination of rights of the former domestic partner.
- (3) As used herein, the term "school" shall only include facilities owned and operated by the Town and shall include, but shall not be limited to, high schools, vocational schools, junior high and middle schools, elementary schools, preschools and preschool programs, after-school programs and day-care programs, provided that such are owned and operated by the Town.

SECTION 6. Employment Benefits

- A. Employees shall be granted bereavement leave, with pay, for the death of a domestic partner or family member of a domestic partner to the same extent as for a spouse or family member of a spouse. Use of the term "in-law" in employee handbooks shall include the relatives of a domestic partner.**

- B. Employees shall be granted sick leave to care for a domestic partner to the same extent permitted to care for a spouse, and to care for a dependent of a domestic partnership to the same extent permitted to care for a child.
- C. Employees in domestic partnerships shall be entitled to take parental leave, as provided for under the Town's by-laws, to the same extent as married employees.

SECTION 7. Interpretation and Limitation of Liability

- A. It is the intention of this Bylaw that its provisions shall be enforceable to the maximum extent permitted by law.
- B. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to impose liability upon a domestic partner for the health or medical expenses of their domestic partner, with the sole exception of the medical insurance contributions assumed by a City or School Department employee who is a member of a domestic partnership.
- C. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to create additional legal liabilities greater than those already existing under law or to create new private causes of action.

SECTION 8. Reciprocity

All rights, privileges and benefits shall be extended to domestic partnerships registered pursuant to similar laws enacted in other jurisdictions.

SECTION 9. Non-Discrimination

No person who seeks the benefit of this Bylaw, registers pursuant to its provisions, or assists another person in obtaining the benefits of this Bylaw shall be discriminated against in any way for doing so.

SECTION 10. Severability

The provisions of this Bylaw are severable. If any of its provisions are held invalid by the Attorney General, a court of competent jurisdiction or other reviewing authority, all other provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

Warrant Article 18 for 2022 Town Meeting:

Rodenticide Reduction and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Arlington

Submitted to Select Board March 24, 2022 for March 28, 2022 Meeting

by Elaine Crowder, Town Meeting Member Precinct 19

ecrowder@communication-exchange.com

Carey Thiel, Arlington Resident -

Article 18/ Phase Out of Certain Toxic Rodenticides on Public/private Property, with Reporting Requirement and Public Education

To see if the Town will vote to amend Title VIII of the Town Bylaws to add a new Article that 1) by January 1, 2024 phases out the use and application of certain rodenticides, including second generation anticoagulant rodenticides (SGARs), either by Town employees or by private contractors on all private and public property in the Town of Arlington except as allowed by the Board of Health to remediate a public health condition; 2) requires all licensed certified applicators of rodenticides to provide written notification to the Board of Health whenever certain rodenticides, including SGARs, are used within the Town; provides for both waivers and penalties for compliance; 3) provides for educating the public about Integrated Pest Management (IPM) best practices and the hazards of rodenticides to human health and the ecosystem during but not limited to licensing, permitting, and inspectional activities; and further establishes such definitions and provisions necessary to effectuate such a bylaw; or take any action related thereto.

PROPOSER'S STATEMENT for Article 18:

A YES vote on this Article will move the bylaw to the Attorney General's Office for review of ALL sections: 1) a phase out of certain rodenticides (e.g., SGARs) in order to exercise local control over local pesticide use to protect local resources (in the spirit of H. Bill 910 An Act Empowering Towns and Cities to Protect Residents and the Environment from Harmful Pesticides (in Committee)), 2) a reporting requirement directing pesticide applicators to report all use within Arlington of rodenticides identified by Town policy, including SGARs, and 3) the provision for educating the public (residents, contractors, businesses) about the hazards of rodenticides, and non-toxic IPM alternatives. These latter two sections can survive as a town bylaw regardless of the AG's decision about Section 1, since a disallowed Section 1 can be severed from the bylaw leaving the remainder in force.

Supporting Materials for Fin Com:

Select Board Vote Monday 3/28/22: Unanimous Support

On 3/28/22 the Select Board voted unanimously to support warrant article 18.

Select Board Members directed Town Counsel to write up Article 18's first section, SGAR Phase out by 2024, as **Special Legislation**.

After excision of this first section, Article 18 proposes to amend Title XIII of the Town Bylaws in the following two ways: 1) create a reporting requirement for “certain rodenticides, including SGARs), and 2) require education of the public about IPM best practices. As written, the education requirement is to be carried out during natural intersection points of the town with the public. Such intersection points include but are not limited to permitting, licensing, inspections, etc.

Financial impact of Article 18:

Phaseout of “certain rodenticides including Second Generation Anticoagulant Rodenticides (SGARs) by Jan 2024

The only practical implementation of a rodenticide phaseout is for the measure to take place uniformly on private and Arlington public lands alike. Otherwise the poisons will still make their way up the food chain and threaten wildlife, including Arlington's nesting bald eagles.

The private portion of this phase out will have no financial impact on the town.

Any costs associated with the implementation of the phase out on public lands would begin at the earliest in 2024 and are dependent on the disposition of special legislation sent to the state. We understand that unless and until submitted special legislation passes the state legislature, budgeting for the phase out is moot.

Although the following information is not immediately relevant, we include it here for your use in longer term planning.

After 2024 and if the special legislation passes, [information from California](#), the state having the most experience with Rodenticide phaseouts (due to a current moratorium on anticoagulant use) is that municipalities and parks commissions may see an initial 10% increase in costs related to employing alternatives to SGARs. The EPA advises initially higher costs often go down over time as populations of rodent pests reduce in size. Ramped up IPM in a community reduces access to food from human sources, which in turn reduces fertility resulting in lower, more balanced populations.

From *Why Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools?* – EPA Report, Nov 2011 (214 pages)

<https://archive.epa.gov/region9/pesticides/web/pdf/ipm-in-schools-guide.pdf>

- **Start-up Costs for Town Buildings (p. 18)**

“During the start-up phase, there are usually costs associated with conversion to IPM. These might include staff training, building repair and maintenance, new waste storage containers, screening, traps, a turf aerator, etc. However, these expenses are usually

recouped within the first year or two of the program, and benefits continue to accrue for years.

- **IPM “Economics.** Integrated pest management, when viewed by traditional economics, **often results in lower costs than conventional pest management.** If other costs, for which dollar signs are not readily available, are considered, **then the balance shifts further towards IPM.**

Some of these poorly accounted-for costs <*when using conventional pest management*> are: potential long term health effects, contamination of the environment, effects of pesticides on non-target animals and plants, the health effects to someone who may be particularly sensitive to a pesticide or pesticides, and any other effects that are not now understood, but will be uncovered over time. Even though these costs are not traditionally considered in economics, they are costs, and should not be ignored.” p. iii

- “**Maryland’s Montgomery County Public Schools** have reported that their IPM program **cut pest control costs by \$6,000 in the first three years of the program (Forbes 1991)**, and IPM improved overall pest control by substituting monitoring, education, sanitation, physical controls, and least toxic pesticides in place of routine use of conventional chemical controls. This is far from an isolated example; schools and school districts in California, Oregon, Florida, Illinois, and elsewhere are adopting IPM and achieving a less-toxic environment for their teachers and students.” -- P. 5 cited from Forbes 1991.
- **Granular Costs:** *Although the following absolute costs are dated, the difference in per building costs using conventional and IPM approaches, and inhouse personnel allocation might be useful in future Fin Com Analyses.*

“According to William Forbes, pest management supervisor for the school district < Montgomery County Public Schools>, under conventional pest control in 1985, the district spent \$513 per building per year. This covered two salaries, two vehicles, and materials for two employees who serviced 150 sites. Only crawling insects and rodents were managed by inhouse staff. An additional \$2400 per building per year was paid for contracted services at 11 sites. By 1988, under an IPM program, those same 11 sites were being managed by in-house staff at a cost of only \$500 per site per year. In addition, a total of 200 school buildings (33% increase) were serviced for a cost of \$575 per building per year, which covered three salaries, three vehicles and supplies. No outside contracting was needed and the program covered virtually every structural pest, from pigeons to termites (Forbes 1990).” P. 18

Reporting Requirement Financial Impact

Reporting Requirement Financial Impact (continued)

Although we are not privy to the precise mechanism the Town will decide to implement for reporting, we are aware such reporting can be semi-automated by providing all licensed, certified pest applicators operating within Arlington with a link to a google forms-style reporting survey that automatically creates a companion spreadsheet for input into Arlington's existing GIS rodent report tracking database and further analysis. Since the time required to write and upload such a form is minimal, (perhaps half a day) and since the rodent tracking GIS system already exists, we anticipate minimal development costs. We defer to the department that the Manager's Office assigns the task of collecting these reports for an estimate of the FTE's involved.

After 2024 or whenever the special legislation to be filed is approved by the legislature and goes into effect, the possibility exists that waiver requests will increase. The Board of Health currently provides waivers to grant schools permission to mitigate health-threatening rodent issues by applying SGARs. So the internal mechanism for entertaining waiver requests appears to exist. Again we defer to the Board of Health for an estimate of FTE's associated with processing waivers.

We are also aware that Marin County, CA experienced no requests for exemptions to the county toxics policy, as of 2020 (1), and that two colleges in California after going poison free experienced no increase in rats (1).

Education Requirement Financial Impact

The education language in Article 18 says the bylaw: "provides for educating the public about Integrated Pest Management (IPM) best practices and the hazards of rodenticides to human health and the ecosystem **during but not limited to licensing, permitting, and inspectional activities**"

We intentionally crafted this section to keep financial impact at a minimum by integrating with public-facing activities Town Departments (BoH, DPW) already engage in (licensing, permitting and inspectional activities). In a conversation with Health and Human Services Director Christine Bongiorno, she indicated that the Board of Health is already doing education as described in Article 18. We anticipate no financial impact beyond the cost of writing and printing a brochure to be handed out during these activities. The BoH as hoped, with its recent 3/31 *Oh Rats!* webinar, is currently demonstrating the ability to further provide proactive education to a broader public within existing budgets and personnel resources.

References

- Raptors Are the Solution (Nov 2020). *Success stories: <CA>agencies and municipalities that have stopped using anticoagulant rodenticides.*

<https://www.raptorsarethesolution.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/10-success-stories.pdf>

- Why Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in School? (Nov 2011). Environmental Protection Agency Report, 214 pages. Accessed 3/30/2022. <https://archive.epa.gov/region9/pesticides/web/pdf/ipm-in-schools-guide.pdf>
- Not numbers, but fun: Who knew? Rodent education can be FUN! *Rodent Control & Public Education Initiative* – Somerville: <https://youtu.be/wEYzKq9YZQI>



From: "Christine Bongiorno" <CBongiorno@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Elaine Crowder" <ecrowder@communication-exchange.com>
Cc: TBradley@town.arlington.ma.us, "Adam Chapdelaine" <AChapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: 03/31/2022 04:13 PM
Subject: Re: Follow up on Article 19, 77 Rodenticide implications for B oH

Hi Elaine,

Apologies for the delay. Attached is the memo regarding the financial impact to the Health Department. Also including Tara Bradley on the email as well.

Thank you,

Christine

Christine Bongiorno, MPH
Director of Health and Human Services
Town of Arlington
27 Maple Street
Arlington, MA 02476
(781)316-3171
www.arlingtonma.gov/hhs

Arlington values equity, diversity, and inclusion. We are committed to building a community where everyone is heard, respected, and protected.

If you are in need of mental health support, please visit: <https://interface.williamjames.edu/contact>

From: Elaine Crowder <ecrowder@communication-exchange.com>
To: Christine Bongiorno <cbongiorno@town.arlington.ma.us>
Cc: Carey Theil <carey@grey2kusa.org>
Date: Thu, 31 Mar 2022 14:41:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Follow up on Article 19, 77 Rodenticide implications for B oH

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Town of Arlington's email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the REAL sender (whose email address in the From: line in "< >" brackets) and you know the content is safe.

Hi Christine,

I wanted check back with you to learn what you've decided about the financial impacts on the Board of Health of Article 18, given that the phase-out provision has been excised and will be submitted as special legislation as per the Select Board's unanimous favorable action decision on Monday 3/28/22.

Thanks so much for any information you can provide!

Best, Elaine
TMM Pct. 19

On 2022-03-30 17:43, Elaine Crowder wrote:

Good morning Christine,
I wanted to follow up on my inquiry about Articles 18 and 77. Have you determined the financial impact in your department?

Thanks so much for sharing in time to use this information in the upcoming Fin Com review on Monday April 4.

Best, Elaine Crowder

--

====

Elaine Crowder, Ph. D.
Communication Exchange
617-923-9135

--

====

Elaine Crowder, Ph. D.
Communication Exchange
617-923-9135

Attachments:

File: <u>ATT00003.txt</u>	Size: 2k	Content Type: text/plain
File: <u>ATT00004.html</u> (Shown Inline)	Size: 8k	Content Type: text/html
File: <u>MArticle18.77.pdf</u>	Size: 87k	Content Type: application/pdf



Town of Arlington
Department of Health and Human Services
Office of the Board of Health

27 Maple Street
Arlington, MA 02476

Tel: (781) 316-3170
Fax: (781) 316-3175

MEMO

TO: Charles Foskett, Finance Committee Chair

FROM: Christine Bongiorno, Director of Health and Human Services

DATE: March 31, 2022

RE: Articles 18 & 77

Upon review of the proposed Articles 18 & 77, it appears that the following areas will fall under the Health Department:

- Collect records of rodenticide application by certified pest control operators
- Educate the public about IPM and about the hazards of rodenticides

One staff member from the Health Department will be assigned to manage this proposed program. As additional duties continue to be added to staff in a department that is already stretched thin, it can be assumed that additional staff will be required to complete added duties in future years.